THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIV NOVEMBER, 1961 No. 497

Editorial

AFTER a previous visit to the U.S.A. in 1947 I published an article in THEOLOGY on "The Appalling Religiousness of America".[1] If this time I was less appalled by that, it may be because I had very few religious engagements. I was not, however, inclined to retract what I previously wrote. As you move further and further west, you are more and more struck by the proliferation and apparent prosperity of religious denominations of all sorts. It is pleasanter to dwell upon the time I spent in the Medical Center at Chicago where a most imaginative attempt is being made to work out what the ministry of the Church should mean in a new social setting.

The Chicago Medical Center, which is still in process of construction, is already the largest concentration of health services in the world—hospitals, colleges of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy and nursing, laboratories, etc. The Medical Center is being built up in what was formerly one of Chicago's worst slum areas. Some 10,000 professional people—faculty, staff, and students—work in the Center, and many of them live there too. It was soon evident that ministry to this great conglomeration of institutions would be beyond the capacity of the existing ecclesiastical systems. Moreover, much more was called for than the provision of religious ministrations for such people as desired them. There was need for the Church to understand the significance of this new social phenomenon dedicated to the study and application of the biological sciences and to the promotion of human health. What had the Church to learn from it, and what had the Church to give? The task of the Church here is analogous to that of industrial mission. The Bishop Anderson Foundation of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which is thoroughly catholic in its outreach and wholesomely secular in its orientation, has already become a centre of community in this Medical Center. Faculty and students find in it a place where they can reflect upon the philosophical and cultural aspects of their work as well as get help in their personal problems and enlarge and deepen their faith. The priests who serve the foundation are able to have much wider contacts and a more varied influence than are open to most hospital chaplains, though they do the ordinary work of hospital chaplains as well. What has been written in THEOLOGY recently about "Religion and Medicine" is here being worked out in highly practical terms.

I also saw in the U.S.A. a good deal that bears on another subject that has lately been discussed in THEOLOGY, "Religion and Road Safety". As I drove over 6,000 miles across the continent, I was everywhere impressed by the provision of magnificent new roads, vari-

[1] THEOLOGY, February 1948. Reprinted in my *Essays in Liberality*.

ously called highways, skyways, expressways, tollways, turnpikes, etc. But it seemed to me that this provision of conditions favourable to road safety was matched by greater skill and consideration in the drivers of vehicles and also by greater respect for regulations about speed limits than we are accustomed to in Britain. Moreover, new experiments with a view to averting the incidence of accidents are constantly being tried out. In one State through which I was driving during the Labour Day weekend (which corresponds to our August Bank Holiday), the Governor had issued an appeal to all drivers to keep their headlights on throughout the daytime, and it seemed that about three-quarters of them responded to this appeal with beneficial results. Paradoxically the effect was to give the roads a funereal complexion since in the U.S.A. cars in funeral processions always drive with their headlights on.

* * * * *

We hope to follow up Mr Paul's article on "Innocence" with further reassessments of traditional virtues.

* * * * *

Autres pays autres mœurs.—"It was a sparkling farewell for the Rev. Richard Crowley in Las Vegas yesterday as the 'Gambler's Priest' was honored in an all-night party by 64 entertainers. The priest, who is being transferred after conducting the 'late, late Mass' on the Las Vegas strip for six years, was escorted on stage by showgirls Anita Raye and Diane Hall."—*The San Francisco Chronicle*, 30 August 1961.

Remembrance Sunday[1]

THE thirteenth verse of the second ode in the third book of Horace begins with one of the most famous lines in Latin poetry. *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.* It is a sweet and fitting (or noble) thing to die for one's country.

That is what Horace says. Is it true? This is a question which ought to be asked in a university. If universities do not exist to distinguish truth from platitude, what do they exist for? Certainly in my time as an undergraduate just before the Second World War Horace's aphorism was not generally thought to be true. A different poem used then to be quoted, a poem by Wilfrid Owen, which describes just how noble and sweet a man looked who had been gassed in war.

> If in some smothering dreams, you too could pace
> Behind the wagon that we flung him in,

[1] An address given in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, on Remembrance Sunday, 1960.

And watch the white eyes writhing in his face,
His hanging face, like a devil's sick of sin:
If you could hear, at every jolt, the blood
Come gargling from the froth-corrupted lungs,
Bitter as the cud
Of vile, incurable sores on innocent tongues,—
My friend, you would not tell with such high zest
To children ardent for some desperate glory,
The old Lie: Dulce et decorum est
Pro patria mori.

Is it a lie? Well, perhaps Horace was not describing the act of death in battle. Perhaps he was saying that the men themselves who died were sweet and noble. Some undoubtedly were. We do wrong if we do not to-day remember our heroes, men and women, who were brave because they drove themselves on by their sense of duty. Or whose sense of honour would not allow them to show fear. Or who never thought to show any regard for their own safety. Or who behaved with that kind of gay spontaneity and recklessness which has always been admired as such an attractive human quality. These men were willing to die because many of them believed that in so doing they could preserve justice and freedom. And what is more, their wives or parents were willing too—let us to-day remember those who lost their sons and lovers in pride and anguish. Theirs was the pride which inspired Horace's line of poetry—the pride of the Roman mother who last all her sons in war but said that had she yet another son she would still gladly give him to the republic. Theirs also was the anguish which struck King David when he heard that Absalom was killed. For though Absalom had led a rebellion against his father, you will remember that when David was told the news of his death in battle, "the king was much moved and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept; and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom, my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!"

But life is not like melodrama where all heroes are white and all villains are black. Some men who were recklessly brave and memorable leaders were also evil. They, and others who lacked these redeeming qualities, made the most of their war as they looted, raped and murdered their way across Europe or Asia. The deaths they caused behind the front line were neither noble nor sweet. The concentration camps, the slaughter of civilians and children, the shame of twentieth-century barbarism is a universal shame; and though in the last war it lay heaviest upon Nazi Germany, the armed forces of all nations indulged in the brutality that war begets.

And in a curious way Horace's line seems even falser when we think of the vast majority of those who were killed in war. They were neither heroes nor villains. Many of them thought only that their own lives had been disrupted. Few of them thought much about their country and still less of its cause. Sometimes happily, sometimes sullenly, more often indifferently, they accepted their lot. Often they endured it without distinction and were killed without glory, all caught up in a calamity not of their making, the children

of disaster. What Horace said is not universally true of all men who die in war. Is there, then, any sense in which we can say that it is noble and sweet to die for one's country?

There *is* a sense in which we can say so. For in our commemoration to-day we are re-asserting a sociological fact. The fact is that from earliest times men who died in battle were honoured. They were honoured simply because it was assumed—you can call it a myth if you like—that they *had* died for the sake of their homes, their fellow-countrymen, their city or country and their gods. It did not matter whether they were good or bad. It did not matter whether their cause was just. It did not matter whether they understood the reason why. They were honoured because all men are born citizens of some country, and those who die for their country in some sense die for their fellow-citizens. We are what we are partly, at any rate, because we are Englishmen or Frenchmen or Russians or Americans. Whether we owe our country a life is debatable—but if in fact a man's life is taken from him in war, then the least his countrymen can do is to honour him. That is why there is no incongruity that Germans as well as British honour their dead. That is why in the war-memorial side-chapel you will find the name of a Kingsman, Ferenc Bekassy, who died in the First World War fighting in the Austro-Hungarian army against his English contemporaries.

There is another reason why we honour these dead. They were overwhelmed by a universal human tragedy. That tragedy is war, which has always been endemic in the history of mankind. Consequently men have always recognized that there is a special pathos in death at war. Those who were killed died far from home, far from their wives, their children, their fathers and mothers. They had no one of their family near them to assuage the agony of death. Most of them died young. It is untrue and sentimental to pretend that all men who were killed were heroes, but it is not sentimental to recollect that they were young and to mourn the years they lost. Life is precious and death is terrible, and to achieve something in life is an honourable ambition even if it is merely to live so as to be loved and respected by your family and neighbours as a man of honesty and charity. This was denied them.

That is why their death was bitter. And the bitterness of death is one of the themes of the greatest of all war poets. Homer knew how savage and bitter war was. "The cruel earth was heaped over them," he wrote, "where they died far from their native land." "There on the Trojan plain," says Nestor, "our bravest died. Achilles himself and Patrocolus whose wisdom was godlike. And there, too, died my lovely son, the strong, clean Antilochus, who was surpassingly sure-footed and a fighter." Homer's heart is with the luckless as well as with the heroes. "Then Diomede slew them and robbed them of their sweet life." Homer knew that life was sweet; and death, however noble and honourable, was not.

To-day, not only do we remember those who died fighting: we also pray that there shall never be another war. We can do little

else but pray. I do not mean that we should deride the efforts of those who write books and pamphlets, who hold meetings and march in demonstrations, in order to convince their fellow-citizens that war should be outlawed. If you are really convinced by the arguments behind the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, or if you believe that our country and others should make sacrifices to reduce tension between nations, then by all means take what action seems fitting to you. As Kingsmen, we should particularly honour the name of a Fellow of the College, now long dead, Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, who spent the last years of his life working to establish the League of Nations. He did not live to see his hopes fail —to see the inability of the League to prevent a Second World war. And yet it may be—we cannot say more than that—it may possibly be that in centuries to come men may look back and see in that imperfect institution the first concerted attempt by nations to settle all disputes without recourse to war. So, similarly, the efforts which men of goodwill make to-day, may possibly do good.

But do not be deceived. You may well feel that the horrors of nuclear war are so appalling to contemplate that we must declare that war is intolerable—just as some of your predecessors felt that the horrors of trench and gas warfare must convince all sane men that in no circumstances should we ever fight again. But those who feel so should remember that to want peace, however passionately, is not in itself any guarantee that you will preserve it. The leaders of this country before the last war—Stanley Baldwin, Neville Chamberlain, Edward Halifax, Samuel Hoare—were so stirred by the slaughter of the First World War that they dedicated themselves to maintain peace and were determined not to provoke another war. Yet though they wanted peace they did not get it—and most people to-day believe that they were calamitously misguided in their policy to preserve peace. There is no guarantee that if governmental policy was changed war would for ever be averted. The more historians study the causes of war, the more it appears that only rarely is culpable folly or deliberate evil on the part of statesmen responsible for the outbreak of war. Usually wars are caused by that collective wrong-doing and muddle and suspicion and vanity and misapprehension that to a Christian is all part of original sin and to others is the inescapable tragedy of man's existence on earth. That is why we can do no more than pray that there shall never be another war.

Homer knew this well. In the *Iliad* the old tutor of Achilles tells him that men are ruined through their own infatuation. But, so he goes on to say, the suffering that their infatuation and pride bring can sometimes be healed by prayer.

> Prayers are the daughters of Zeus, though they are lame and wrinkled and blear-eyed. They go behind ruinous Infatuation, always dogging her. But Infatuation is strong and fleet-footed: she easily outruns them all, and arrives before them over all the earth, doing men harm. Then the Prayers come behind to cure the hurt. If a man respects these daughters of Zeus when they approach him, they do him much good and they hear him when he prays. But if a man refuses them and stubbornly rejects them, they go and pray to Zeus the son of Cronos that Infatuation may go with

him, so that he be harmed and pay the penalty. But do you, Achilles, give the daughters of Zeus their honour.

Homer meant that prayer teaches you to see your own ambition and pride in perspective, in relation to mankind as a whole: and in so doing teaches you humility, and from that humility wisdom.

That is why, whatever our beliefs, it is worth while praying in our hearts that there shall be no war, so that whatever follies and crimes men commit, and in whatever desperate dilemmas they find themselves as power shifts from nation to nation, they will not resort to it. But never let this wish prevent us from honouring those less fortunate than we—those who were killed in war. For if we put the question again—is it a sweet and noble thing to die for one's country?—the answer must be: No, it is not sweet, it is bitter . . . bitter. But it *is* noble.

NOËL ANNAN.

Innocence

"IGNORANCE is not innocence but sin," said Robert Browning, and Milton was in the same mood when he wrote that he could not praise "a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race". "Assuredly," he went on, "we bring not innocence into the world, we bring impurity much rather: that which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary." And his definition of a true Christian as one who could "apprehend and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures and yet abstain" corresponds pretty strictly with the modern temper. Neither in Christian nor secular quarters is innocence a virtue anyone appears prepared to defend any more, or even to recommend without seeming impossibly naive and démodé. The Victorians had a romantic conception of innocence which they kept in hand for children and young women, and we do not like the Victorians. Their literature is full of little Dombeys dying away in their pathetic innocence and fragility from a cruel world, or of young women cloistered in the way Milton condemns, struggling, even religiously, to hold fast to that purity which seems possible only to the very innocent, and is lost for good once innocence is gone. They so valued purity and innocence that in the end they were scandalized at the suggestion that childhood was perhaps more innocent in appearance than in truth, and could not bring themselves to believe that behind maidenly simpers lurked the sensual appetites we take to-day as healthy. They protested too much; nevertheless, echoes of the enormous value the world placed upon purity and innocence, at least in the young, beat about my very young head in Edwardian days, and have never quite lost their power over me.

We have changed all that since and reverted to the harsher and less sentimental view of Milton, and under the influence of Freud

and a host of fellow-travellers, and on scientific evidence, are prepared to accept that we bring impurity into the world rather than innocency and trail exhaust flames of libido rather than clouds of glory. The young to-day rather solemnly accept that to be innocent, in the sense of not to know, or not to have had a certain experience, is a kind of dishonour. To be chaste, to refrain from sexual experience, for example, is almost certainly considered by thoughtful contemporaries as an unfulfilment, an impoverishment intolerable in an affluent society. Society is left wondering whether adolescent sexual experiment and intercourse are not only excusable but valuable therapeutically. One can find even parsons prepared to argue this. Certainly the increase in deliberate sexual education of the young, the freedom with which sex is exploited commercially and the general outspokenness of our society about everything bring us round to the point that the social decision is that innocence is a kind of ignorance and is therefore disreputable. And if we are prepared to make this equation there is something not only pathetic but simple, foolish, artless in the fly exploring the gun-barrel or the lamb skipping on the way to the slaughterers or the child innocently straying into the traffic stream. We are privately scandalized by such lack of sophistication. We are the twentieth century.

But suppose we do not make this easy equation between innocence and ignorance? and refuse, as we really must, to argue Christian ethics purely in terms of sexual ethics and therefore always to equate innocence with chastity? The Christian faith burns everlastingly with a certain Blakean innocence which embraces wonderingly both the tiger and the lamb. When we speak of the sinlessness of Jesus we do not mean that he lacked experience but that he was innocent. It was not just that he fell into no sin: he did not desire in his heart to do the things he forbade himself: he was not simply prudent, he was pure in heart and that in itself is the most shining form of innocence. His teachings are couched in terms of simple unworldly sheep who are faced with the ravening wolves of society. The gospels are on the side of the innocent and unsophisticated, the widow with her mite, the importunate Syro-Phoenician woman, Zacchaeus climbing his tree, and against the ambitious, cunning, spell-binding power addicts. In terms of our own society Jesus was against the evil persuaders, hidden or otherwise, and on the side of the silly who were always being fleeced or seduced by them. The lambs, the lost sheep, the prodigal children constitute the first charge on Jesus, who is not content with them as they are but seeks to save them, urging them to that draining-out of egoism and acceptance of God which we call faith. He praises it most when it has that kind of innocency about it that we find in the story of the centurion whose servant was sick or of the father of the epileptic boy the disciples could not heal. He loved children and spoke stern words against those who rejected or corrupted them.

The Christian story abounds with symbols of innocence, from the Virgin with her child born in a rude stable to the saints in childlike simplicity not simply facing martyrdom with courage but welcom-

ing it with hymns of praise because it would bring them close to the sufferings of their Saviour and would hasten their return to his company. There is, in St Francis, the kind of Christian fool who is the child of God and the despair of the world. We ourselves, twentieth century or not, are still able to be moved and solaced by the devotion of monks and nuns in the cloister because they have given up what they could of the world and sought to live in innocence instead. In them, and in the faces of those who live intensely spiritual lives, we recognize the innocency of men and women lost in God. Whatever the temper of our age we cannot abandon this element of the Christian faith without impoverishing it. Were we to do so, we should cease to be able to see what the band of disciples around Jesus was like.

If the secular world really meant what it said when it equated innocence with ignorance, then it would always value knowledge above innocence, and it even seems a heresy to doubt it! If it equated innocence with lack of *sexual* experience, then what it would always value above innocence would be that experience. But in fact it does not count knowledge and experience as absolute values, whatever it may think. To be concrete, the intelligence reports of Mau-Mau atrocities are suppressed, or available only with difficulty. Simply to read them, that is to know about them, is to be overthrown with horror and anguish. No one would really argue that knowledge of these things is of greater value than ignorance of them. In the same way, it is not possible to argue that, in the secular world, sexual experience is always preferable to sexual innocence (incest? rape?), nor even more generally that experience is inevitably to be valued above inexperience. It must be better not to have had experience of murder, or of the extermination of the Jews, than to have had it. In more cases than it thinks, society must value ignorance and innocence higher than knowledge and experience. In truth, in our age, innocence is still valued, though unconsciously rather than consciously, for the reason that with innocence moral and spiritual growth are still possible, while certain acts and experiences, even certain kinds of knowledge, stultify moral growth and kill the life of the spirit. Only the most spiritually powerful or spiritually prepared can survive them.

However, we can usefully go on to ask whether the social devaluation of innocence has ever really taken place! At the heart of contemporary society in the most unexpected places we find a longing for the renewal that only innocence can bring. Even in Marxism, for example, a tough theory of history if ever there was one, which preaches that force has always triumphed, that expediency rather than goodness has conquered in the past, that progress is accomplished by a violence in which the innocent probably suffer most, even here we find a paradisal theory of innocence predominating. According to Marxism, the world is to move on to a classless society. In it the jails will go, the police and the courts will be abolished, there will be no more crime, no more oppression and tyranny, all men will be free, and freely co-operating beings. What

is postulated is the coming of the paradise of Adam and Eve inhabited by a mankind raised to the moral heights of the Galilean apostles. The "scientific" theories of revolution-making which Marx put forward attracted the power-hungry, the ravening wolves—but the masses to whom Marxism made a moral as well as a material appeal hungered most for this paradisal future for man. What, for Marxism, was the value of this extraordinary innocence in which future man would dwell? Simply this, that the real history of man might then begin and all the wars, terror and revolutions of the past would be relegated to the prehistory of man. But there would be no special value in a society without struggle if men and women in it simply ate and drank, grew fat and folkdanced. The hidden meaning of this longing was that man could not come to birth as a spiritual being until his aggressive, lusting ego was brought under control, until in fact he died to himself and achieved again that kind of loving transparency of being which is the true innocence and which we see in the eyes of saints or understand from the great artists. It is hardly necessary to say that the socialist, working class and pacific movements of a couple of centuries have been fired with this dream of the renewal of man's basic innocence. It is the heart of William Morris's *News from Nowhere* and of H. G. Wells's *A Modern Utopia.* The possibility of it haunts the Romantic movement. It is the romantic dream of the uncorrupted, natural man, of man restored to an aboriginal purity of being.

Yet there is a manner in which we attain this innocence with or without benefit of Christianity, and value it above all things. I mean in the arts, or at least in the high arts, in poetry, music, less clearly in painting and creative prose writing. A poet, for example, may do all within his power to learn what it is to be a writer or a poet, to study his craft, to absorb what the masters have done. He may scheme and be driven by ambition. But the more his work is dominated by a certain kind of calculation the less it will succeed as poetry. There comes a point when he cannot any longer contrive, but must surrender. He cannot even feel "how clever I am", but must give himself to his poetry in faith, in innocency, emptying self out so that he may be filled full with it. And then, maybe (for nothing is guaranteed), there will be poetry. . .

> Loveliest of trees, the cherry now
> Is hung with bloom along the bough,
> And stands about the woodland ride
> Wearing white for Eastertide.
>
> (Housman)

or

> Everyone suddenly burst out singing;
> And I was filled with such delight
> As prisoned birds must find in freedom
> Winging wildly across the white
> Orchards and dark green fields; on; on; and out of sight.
>
> (Sassoon)

or Traherne's prose

> The corn was orient and immortal wheat, which never should be reaped, nor was ever sown. I thought it had stood from everlasting to everlasting.

> The dust and stones of the street were as precious as gold: the gates were at first the end of the world. The green trees when I saw them first through one of the gates transported and ravished me, their sweetness and unusual beauty made my heart to leap, and almost mad with ecstasy, they were such strange and wonderful things. The Men! O what venerable and reverend creatures did the aged seem! Immortal Cherubims! And young men glittering and sparkling Angels, and maids strange seraphic pieces of life and beauty! Boys and girls tumbling in the street, and playing, were moving jewels. I knew not that they were born or should die . . .

and so on in that immortal meditation in which he speaks of the ravishing of his childhood senses by the beauty of the world. He is, in his infant innocence, transparent to the world. God burns right through him. He remembers this all through his life: it is his major spiritual experience. It seems to me that the basic problem of the artist is to achieve this transparency to the world, which so closely resembles the state which is given to the child without asking. But the childhood state is mixed up with ignorance and fear and cannot long survive the shocks of what Traherne calls the "dirty devices of this world". The spiritual journey of the artist is to come back to this state when he is transparent enough to the world that, despite all his sufferings and experiences, as well as because of them, the spirit can speak through him. It is the same renewal of innocence which we find sometimes in the mother, often in the saint. The longing for it haunts every man and every movement which dreams of a better and more human world, of a redeemed mankind. It is given us, epigrammatically, in the Saviour's metaphor that he who would enter the kingdom of heaven must be born again and become as a little child.

LESLIE PAUL.

Revised Reviews: XI—Charles Booth's Life and Labour of the People in London[1]

"IT cannot be said that there are no results, or, if we consider the whole population, that they are not in some sense reached by the Church and by other religious bodies; but the results are very disappointing. Response is lacking. The mass of the people make no profession of faith and take no interest in religious observances" (1. 27). "The mass of the population remains alienated or unconcerned" (1. 31). Such are two of Charles Booth's comments on the work of the Churches in London at the turn of the century. Competent sociological study can teach the Churches a realism about their mission, which is the main case for the Churches' developing a sociological point of view upon themselves as institutions among other institutions and upon the world in which they are set. The nineteenth century saw a considerable growth of this sociological

[1] Third Series: Religious Influence. 7 vols. 1902–3.

point of view with the 1851 census of religion[1] and other studies and censuses, particularly in London,[2] which Booth crowned with his great study. Yet after the First World War this development halted, a consequence of the Churches' weaker position and of the sociologists' lack of interest in religion.[3] The new London survey of the 1920s did not repeat the study of religious influences. Only to-day are there signs that the Churches are returning to the width of vision of our great-grandparents in the faith. The signs lie in the statistical unit of the Board of Finance in the Church of England,[4] in the Newman Demographic Survey in the Roman Catholic Church, in a number of individual studies[5] and in an interest in sociological work undertaken by the Churches abroad, notably in France.[6]

Charles Booth, the Liverpool Unitarian, shipowner and business man, was a remarkable man, and those who would explore his career and contribution to the social sciences should read the recent book of Prof. and Mrs Simey.[7] Booth devoted fifteen years and £33,000 of his own money to his study of London. The first two series of *Life and Labour* were on poverty and industry in London, in which Booth showed the connexion between poverty, crowding and low wages, and laid a basis of factual information upon which later legislation could be built and prevailing assumptions about the causes of poverty changed. Booth had not finished. "The task which I had originally proposed to myself was done. Yet I did not feel satisfied to leave it so, for just as life day by day is conditioned by the character of the home, the opportunities of education or recreation and the change of employment, so there are the other social influences which form part of the very structure of life, and some account of them is necessary to complete the picture of things as they are—among these influences Religion claims the chief part" (1. 4).

He intended to study religious institutions in the context of other social agencies and problems: local government, police, housing, prostitution and crime, marriage, thrift; but while some information about these matters is given in the seven volumes of the Religious Influences series very little relating is done. The series is a descriptive account of the religious institutions of London, leaving aside the Jews, area by area, parish by parish, with reference to social factors like class, age and sex, and attempting to assess the vitality

[1] Census of 1851: *Report on Religious Worship* (C. 1690).

[2] *Religion in London:* statistics of church and chapel accommodation in the *British Weekly*, No. 85, 1866. *The Religious Census of London*, 1888, results of the census conducted by the *British Weekly*, 24 October 1886. *The Religious Life of London*, ed. R. Mudie-Smith, 1904, contains results of a census carried out by the *Daily News* from November 1902 to November 1903 with comments upon them.

[3] Cf. N. Birnbaum, "La Sociologie de la Religion en Grande-Bretagne", in *Archives de Sociologie des Religions*, July–December 1956.

[4] Cf. The Church Information Office's *Facts and Figures of the Church of England*, 1959.

[5] E.g. E. R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City*, 1957.

[6] E.g. F. Boulard, *An Introduction to Religious Sociology*, 1960.

[7] T. S. and M. B. Simey, *Charles Booth: Social Scientist*, 1960.

of the religious bodies and their apparent effect upon their area of influence. "My concern in the matter of religion is solely with the extent to which people accept the doctrine, and share the work of the religious bodies, and with the effect produced, or apparently produced in their lives" (1. 2). He did not set himself up as a critic of religion, although he had certain religious asssumptions, such as a bias in favour of the more intellectual forms of religion, and therefore of certain middle-class Congregationalist chapels which he visited, and these occasionally emerge in his judgments. "My principal aim is still confined to the description of things as they are. I have not undertaken to investigate how they came to be so, nor except incidentally to indicate where they are tending; and only to a very limited extent, or very occasionally, has any comparison been made with the past" (1. 5).[1]

Booth started work on the third series with his five assistants in 1897. They collected written information and publications, interviewed the heads of every religious and social agency (1,800 interviews in all) and checked the outcome of these by visiting every church, chapel, mission hall, etc., in every district of London, much of this personally by Booth. The writing of the volumes began at the end of 1900. The first six descriptive volumes appeared in 1902 and the seventh, summarizing and drawing conclusions, in 1903.[2] A criticism made at the time was that Booth did not support his conclusions with statistical evidence, but the statistics produced in *The Religious Life of London*, which appeared in 1904, confirmed Booth and undermined his critics. The reception generally was favourable, even if only a few like Hensley Henson thoroughly read the seven volumes. Booth's honesty, impartiality and desire to understand the position of the Churches disposed his readers to note his criticisms, although he could at times be acid, as when he spoke of the relief work of some sisterhoods as "lacking both in religious tolerance and in social insight" (7. 353) or of the exaggerated language and claims of some denominations and mission work.

He wrote before the nineteenth-century religious boom among the middle and upper classes broke, during the great days of such parishes as St Mary Abbot, Kensington, which, he says, "rests on a middle zone between rich and poor—it requires a year-book of 275 pages to describe the organisations and an income of £20,000 to support them. The congregations at the mother church are truly

[1] Where he allows himself an historical observation, his selection has its interest. To characterize Central South London he draws upon an Historical Souvenir of the old Borough Road Baptist Chapel, founded in 1673, in which was written: "Southwark lies low; the greater part being some six inches beneath the level of the Thames. In early days, from the river to the Clapham and Brixton hills, it was largely swamp and marsh. To these retreats outlaws, debtors, thieves and rascals of every breed resorted; laying for Southwark the foundation of that questionable character it has never wholly lost" (4. 4).

[2] Vol. 1. London North of the Thames: The Outer Ring. Vol. 2. London North of the Thames: The Inner Ring. Vol. 3. The City of London and the West End. Vol. 4. Inner South London. Vol. 5. South East and South West London. Vol. 6. Outer South London. Vol. 7. Summary of Religious Influences.

parochial and very large. Besides ten clergy, a great force of volunteers is employed. The success in its way is marked, and leads to a note of self-warning, seldom required in London: 'Our danger is to look at what is being done, and the numbers, and to forget what is being left undone' " (3. 106).

Yet the total picture which Booth saw was different. He noted the importance of class divisions both in religious practice and in affiliation to particular denominations. "The great bulk of those of rank and station among our people belong to the Church of England, and their relations with the Church are easy and confident" (7. 394–5). The professional classes were also Church of England, while among the broad span of the middle classes the Free Churches claimed their share. "The great section of the population, which passed by the name of the working classes, lying socially between the lower middle class and the 'poor', remains as a whole outside of all the religious bodies, whether organised as churches or missions, and as those of them who join any church become almost indistinguishable from the class with which they mix, the change that has really come about is not so much *of* as *out of* the class to which they have belonged" (7. 399).

Booth comments that it is social factors rather than unbelief which keeps the working classes away. As adults they remain untouched; there is contact with the children but they are hard to hold. Families as units are not influenced at all. "The British working man, if he awakes at all from indifference, is hostile; if moved at all spiritually, it is by the simplest Gospel teaching; if intellectually, it is by the Unitarians; but his active interests are much more commonly political than religious" (7. 258). This is a sentence worth careful analysis to-day. Booth also notes that improvements in living conditions, shorter working hours, increased prosperity do not move working men towards the churches. The social pressures are still against church-going. The habit of detachment is too strong.

The end of the nineteenth century saw the Churches still in their role of dispensers of welfare. A constant theme of the volumes is Booth's condemnation of the link of voluntary charity with the religious bodies, because of its effects upon the poor. The charity dispensed was inadequate and spasmodic and fostered hypocrisy, while some denominations competed for adherents by use of their tickets, blankets and outings. The Churches were brought into disrepute. It is an interesting reflection that the common accusation of hypocrisy against church-goers stems from this method of relief as well as from the church-goers' failure to measure up to their profession. At the same time Booth exposed the almost total lack of success of missions in working-class areas either as permanent outposts or as sporadic campaigns, which he referred to as "spiritual dram-drinking". "In almost every case the bulk of those who attend are regular church-goers, and it may be questioned whether they really profit by these high-pressure experiences. As to outsiders, for whose sake more particularly the missions are held, the attempt is always practically a failure, some will be attracted, and of them a

few may be deeply moved to adopt a new life; but, as with ordinary missions, such success is a question of a few individuals, difficult to win, and still more difficult to hold. The mass remain untouched" (7. 275).

Booth saw a massive effort, honestly undertaken but with illusions. There was the illusion that people wanted the Gospel, and the illusion that some gesture by the Churches would do the trick, a rewritten service, the Bishop of Stepney living in East London, a modern building, some novelty. There was a lack of sociological dimension in the thinking of the clergy whom Booth interviewed. No one responsible for Church policy in London who would learn from Booth could fail to see that religious life as well as other aspects of a man's life were affected by great social forces, some peculiar to London and some general in a great metropolitan city. A person in a similar position to-day could do far worse than check his assessment of the situation with Booth's sixty years ago, noting the constant factors and the elements of change. How useful further studies would be which retraced some of Booth's ground in the changed conditions of to-day! One of Booth's achievements is to have provided in his great work a point of reference for the missionary strategy of the Churches in London.

More generally Booth can still teach the Churches sociological imagination; to see themselves critically as one social institution among others, influencing and being influenced, and to see the larger forces in society at work upon themselves and thus realistically to plan policies which touched society in a significant way. To his fellow sociologists Booth may show religion, religious attitudes, institutions, influences to be a necessary study if they are to portray society in its totality.

M. J. Jackson.

The Abortive Revision of the Communion Office in 1661

Three hundred years ago, in November 1661, to the episcopal committee charged by the upper house of the Convocation of Canterbury with proceeding in the work of revising the Book of Common Prayer, there was presented for consideration an alternative communion office, in which, had it been accepted, the Church of England would have regained a rite bearing at least a tolerable resemblance to the classical liturgies of Christendom. But it was not to be, and by the draft copy of the canon of that office, William Sancroft was constrained to write, "My Lords the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method".

The proposed office was a respectable, if not ideal, piece of liturgical craftsmanship, and had it been adopted the subsequent history of the Church of England might have been very different. This alone is reason enough to pay it some attention in this tercentenary year—to note its structure and contents, and the theology underlying

them, and first to attempt to ascertain clearly who was responsible for its composition and who for its rejection. It survives in two texts, with minor variants. One is in the prayer book of 1619 containing amendments and annotations in the hands of Cosin and Sancroft, and commonly known as the "Durham Book", preserved in the Cosin Library at Durham; the other is in a prayer book of 1634 amended in the hand of Sancroft, commonly known as "Sancroft's Fair Copy", and preserved in the Bodleian Library.[1] After the example of the Rev. G. J. Cuming, we will refer to these volumes respectively as DB and FC.

When was DB compiled, and by whom? Clearly it cannot have been begun before 1620,[2] nor can it have been completed after November 1661. Equally clearly, Cosin was at the least prominent among the compilers. But within these limits, four different theories worth consideration have been held about the identity of the compiler or compilers, and the date at which it was compiled. The book has been asserted to be the work of Cosin, alone and unaided, other than in a capacity purely clerical by Sancroft, over a period of some twenty-one years, 1640–61.[3] On the other hand, it has been maintained to be the product of a committee of bishops, to whom Cosin was no more than a secretary, and that during the vacation of Convocation, 31 July–21 November 1661.[4] One cannot but suspect that the protagonists of these views were influenced by their respective desires to magnify and reduce the share of Cosin in the 1661–2 revision.[5] A third theory agrees with the second but ascribes to Cosin a prominence, or even a dominance, in the supposed committee. This account, which has some support from the evidence at first sight, has attracted several scholars, including Brightman.[6] Nevertheless, close examination reveals that the only real ground for the hypothesis of an episcopal committee, official or unofficial, working on the revision during the vacation, is a vague remark of Clarendon,[7] which is quite insufficient evidence, the more so as other evidence suggests that the bishops in general were otherwise and urgently engaged.[8] The fourth theory is that proffered by the Rev. G. J. Cuming,[9] who maintains DB to be the joint work of Cosin

[1] Mr Cuming points out, in his article *The Making of the Durham Book* in *JEH* for April 1955, at pp. 60 ff., that some of the entries in the ordinal of FC are in the hand of Cosin. Op. cit., p. 72.

[2] The psalter of DB is of this year.

[3] E.g. by James Parker in his *An Introduction to the History of the Successive Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer* (1877).

[4] E.g. by J. T. Tomlinson in *The Prayer Book, Articles and Homilies* (1897).

[5] Parker was concerned to prove the Prayer Book to be thoroughly Tractarian, and Tomlinson to prove that it was nothing of the kind.

[6] Brightman, *The English Rite*, p. cxcvi; Selborne, *Notes on some Passages in the Liturgical History of the Reformed English Church* (1878), p. 43; Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement* (1951), p. 244, by implication.

[7] Cf. Cuming, op. cit., p. 68, and Selborne, op. cit., p. 43, and their references.

[8] Most of the bishops had more than enough to keep them busy in their dioceses during the vacation. Cf. Bosher, op. cit., pp. 231-7.

[9] Op. cit.

and Wren, who "systematically worked through DB with their respective lists of suggestions, together with the Scottish Liturgy and other sources"[1] on the ground that "The bulk of the entries derive from Wren's *Advices*, written in the spring of 1660, and Cosin's *Particulars*, completed in December of the same year"[2] while suggesting that "some of the entries may have been made [by Cosin] as early as 1627".[3] Cuming has clearly examined the evidence far more thoroughly than any of his predecessors, and his argument for the ascription of authorship to Cosin and Wren together is convincing.

As for the date of the compilation of DB, Cuming holds that, while some of the entries may be as early as 1627, "DB has no connection with the revision discused in 1641"[4] and that the bulk of the work, the joint effort of Wren and Cosin, dates from the winter and spring of 1660–1. He concludes: "On leaving for Durham in early August 1661, Cosin handed over both books to Sancroft, who carefully revised the whole of DB, possibly supervised by Wren, and then copied out the final state into FC. . . . The result was submitted to 'my Lords the Bishops at Ely House' in November 1661. . . ."[5]

It certainly seems unlikely that this work was wholly performed during the July–November vacation: the internal evidence suggests, indeed requires, prolonged and repeated reconsideration, and for that there does not seem to have been sufficient opportunity after July 1661. As upon the authorship, so upon the date, Cuming's judgment is more acceptable than that of Selborne and Brightman.[6] The question arises, however, when was the work completed? And this is linked inseparably with another and greater question: who rejected the revised communion office? For if the latter was never in fact presented to the official episcopal committee, as appears commonly to be supposed, after 21 November, but was rejected by some unofficial junto—Wren, Cosin, Sheldon?—earlier in the month, then clearly it had already been relegated to the secondary place it occupies in FC at an even earlier date, presumably by Cosin and Wren themselves, or one of them, in which case both books must have been completed at that date.[7] And that brings us, to say the least, very near a date at which Cosin had not yet returned from Durham, with the result that we must ascribe all the important differences between DB and FC—including this reduction of the revised canon to an alternative—to Wren alone (for it is not likely that Sancroft made such major changes on his own authority). Cuming indeed holds that this further revision, in many respects reversing the existing amendments of DB, "may be due to the influence of Wren asserting itself more strongly in Cosin's absence"[8] and says of the

[1] Op. cit., p. 72. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid., and cf. pp. 61-3.
[4] Ibid., p. 72. [5] Ibid.
[6] I am not, however, entirely happy with Cuming's argument (pp. 64-5) concerning the omission from DB of suggestions of the *Particulars* relating to an Act of Uniformity. His conclusion lacks both proof and necessity.
[7] Cf. Cuming, op. cit., p. 69. [8] Ibid., p. 70.

communion office: "The rearrangement was ardently desired by Cosin, but Wren nowhere mentions it, though it is substantially the same as that in SL; this may then be a further instance of Wren's influence."[1] Now, while I think that there is a great deal in the theory of the predominant influence of Wren at this stage, I cannot ascribe to him alone, as I shall show later, this supremely significant reversal of the proposals of DB. Nor can I agree with Cuming in his tentative identification of "My Lords the Bishops at Ely House": "This phrase may refer either to the Convocation Committee appointed on 21 November, or to the informal consultations with Wren and Sheldon for which Cosin was recalled to London at the beginning of November. The latter is more likely, for the Convocation Committee, though directed to meet at Ely House, agreed to meet 'in hac domo pro praesenti'."[2] And again, ". . . the phrase 'My Lords the Bishops at Ely House' refers to a private meeting between Wren, Cosin, and Sheldon which took place at the beginning of November. . . ."[3]

Before we can identify their Lordships, we have to ask and answer another question, namely, can we state, as a number of scholars have stated,[4] and as Cuming clearly implies, that this committee of eight did *not* meet at Ely House during the autumn Convocation? Obviously, if it did not, then Sancroft's remark cannot refer to it; if it did, it is very likely indeed, on the face of it, that Sancroft's note does refer to it.

The case for the eight bishops having met at Ely House rests upon the fact that they were ordered so to do: ". . . *dictus reverendus pater* [*i.e. Archiep. Cantuar.*] *cum unanimi consensu confratrum suorum, elegit reverendos in Christo Patres . . . NN et commisit vices suas eisdem, aut eorum tribus ad minus, ad procedendum in dicto negotio; et ordinavit eos ad conveniendum apud palatium reverendi patris domini Episcopi Elien, hora quinta post meridiem cujuslibet diei* (*exceptis diebus dominicis*) *donec dictum negotio perficiatur.*"[5] It is reasonable to suppose that they acted accordingly unless there is definite evidence to the contrary. The case that they did not do so is based upon a further sentence in the record, held by some to provide such evidence: "*Et postea consensum fuit inter dictos episcopos pro meliori et citiori festinatione dicti negotii, ut dictus liber Publicarum Precum revideatur in hac domo pro praesenti . . .*"[6]—also upon the absence of any further reference to these meetings from the records.

This latter argument is untenable, for it involves an interpretation of the text which does the Latin gross violence. We are *not*

[1] Cf. Cuming, op. cit., p. 71.
[2] Ibid., p. 69.
[3] *The Prayer Book in Convocation, November 1661*, in *JEH* for October 1957 (at pp. 182 ff.), p. 185.
[4] E.g. Tomlinson, Cardwell, Swainson; apparently Bosher also, although on this as on other points he is vague; but *not* Parker, who is often asserted to have held this—cf. n. 24. Cuming appears to imply differently in his article of 1957.
[5] Gibson, *Syn. Angl.*, ed. Cardwell (1854), p. 214.
[6] Ibid.

told that the bishops named decided to hold their meetings not at Ely House, but in the Convocation chamber, nor even that they so decided for that particular evening.[1] We are told that they decided "for the better and more rapid expediting of the said business, that the said book of Common Prayer should be reviewed in this house at once". There is no justification in this for Cardwell's nonsensical suggestion that the bishops at once took the matter out of the hands of their own newly appointed committee, while Parker, who gratuitously inserts a dissolution of the house clean contrary to the record,[2] misses the point completely, as indeed do most of those who have written about it.

The point at issue is surely a legal one, and not surprisingly it was Selborne who saw it clearly.[3] Most writers seem to assume that the bishops were commissioned to act as a drafting committee responsible to the house. But this is not what the record says, and what it does say is something quite different and quite clear: "*commisit vices suas . . . ad procedendum in dicto negotio.*" The house of bishops made over its authority to these eight, authorized them to act in its name and stead, in this matter. Nor does the record tell us that these eight thereupon decided to clear the room of their brethren and then hold a first drafting meeting there in order to avoid the move to Holborn. (One may perhaps be allowed to comment in passing that the suggestion that they thought Ely House inconvenient is hardly intelligent—is it likely that they were not consulted about where they wanted to meet?) We are told, not that they decided that they eight should proceed with the work in this *room*, but that they decided that the work should be proceeded with in this *house*. "In hac domo" does *not* mean "in hac camera": it means what it says. In other words they decided that the business being urgent should be dealt with at once, and—as in that case they could hardly have avoided, even had they so wished—to co-opt their brethren on to their own committee for that purpose.

The records of the succeeding days are indeed inadequate, but it is clear from them that while a considerable part of the proceedings took place during the sessions of the upper house, the speed with which the work was accomplished cannot have allowed extensive detailed discussion therein. One is forced to conclude with Selborne —and apparently Cuming, in his 1957 article—that the business was proceeded with both in the formal sessions of the upper house and in the meetings of the committee at Ely House.

Therefore the phrase "My Lords the Bishops at Ely House" could refer to the meetings of the committee of eight, which we must suppose to have taken place, unless and until definite evidence is forthcoming to the contrary, or to the meetings of Cosin, Wren and Sheldon during the weeks preceding Convocation. There appears to be no positive evidence in favour of the latter view, nor any explicit

[1] This was Parker's view: op. cit., p. ccccvii. He did not hold that the committee *never* met at Ely House: cf. ibid., p. ccccxix.

[2] Ibid., p. ccccvii.

[3] Op. cit., p. 46.

evidence to the contrary. Is there any inferential or circumstantial evidence? I believe that such evidence is to be found in the marked divergence between the books DB and FC, and indeed in the very existence of the latter, which seems to me wholly superfluous if Sancroft's note refers to these private meetings of Cosin and Wren with Sheldon. For these meetings, however important and influential, and even supposing more bishops took part in them, for which there is no evidence, were nothing more than private conversations. Is it likely that Sancroft would have gone to all the trouble involved in producing the Fair Copy, merely for it to be discussed in private conversations? Would not DB have done just as well? Cuming rejects the suggestion of Barrow and Parker that DB was presented to the Convocation committee and amended on their instructions precisely because "on this hypothesis it is impossible to account for the existence of the Fair Copy".[1] It is, and it is by no means easy to account for it *except* on the hypothesis that *it was* presented to the Convocation committee.

For consider: it appears fairly certain that DB was the joint work of Cosin and Wren. In DB the rearrangement of the canon and other modifications are definitely proposed. In FC they are placed as an alternative arrangement, "and both left to censure". Now it is possible that this recession from the proposals of DB was due solely to Wren—possible, yes, but not likely. Cuming, from what I cannot but consider insufficient evidence, draws a picture of Wren as a man of moderating tendency. I would agree that there are certain points in DB which bear him out, to some extent. The question is, to what extent? Was he so definitely and actively "moderate" as to reverse the most important proposals of DB, which, if we suppose him to be the co-author, he must at least have approved, and to reverse them at that without consulting his colleague? The answer, I think, must be in the negative. In the first place, Wren was not that kind of man.[2] In the second place, it is impossible to imagine Cosin standing for it—*he* was not *that* kind of man! For the same reasons, it is not likely that the change was made by the two of them together without outside pressure. But this change, together with other, and lesser, recessions from DB to be found in FC,[3] may very well have been the outcome of conversations between the "advanced" Wren and Cosin and a man such as Sheldon, who would know what the general run of the bishops would stomach, and what they would not,[4] and also what it might not be possible to get through Parliament. I do not think that Cosin and Wren would have brought their proposals before Sheldon with a serious difference unresolved between them,[5] and I certainly do not think that Cosin would have

[1] *The Making of the Durham Book*, p. 68.

[2] His whole history is incompatible with such a portrait, and he does not appear to have changed at this time—cf., e.g., Bosher, op. cit., p. 245.

[3] Cuming notes that there are 28 of these: *MDB*, p. 71.

[4] Sanderson, Morley, Henchman and Sheldon himself have all been credited with exercising a strong influence against major changes. For Sanderson, cf. Cuming, *PBC*, pp. 184, 188 ff.

[5] After all, they were two friends working together, not a committee!

allowed Sheldon to reject out of hand his precious revised canon. The most I can conceive of him yielding—possibly, at this stage, on Wren's advice—to pressure on this point from Sheldon is that the two orders of the communion office should be presented as alternatives to the bishops in Convocation (or, as it turned out, to their committee), "and both left to censure". And that, I believe, is what he did. If that is so, the reason for the existence and character of FC in its final form at once becomes obvious: it was the result of the informal conversations between Cosin, Wren and Sheldon, and was presented as such, "left to censure" to "my Lords the Bishops at Ely House", the committee of eight appointed on 21 November. If it is not so, while "my Lords the Bishops at Ely House" may still be the committee of eight, although in this case they *may* instead be the Cosin-Wren-Sheldon trio, we must suppose Sancroft to have gone to the great labour of writing out the communion office "otherwise methodiz'd"—and all the rest—for the benefit of three men engaged in private conversations, who already had a perfectly adequate copy of the revised proposals before them. So ludicrous a proceeding may seem natural to the twentieth century, but it is not typical of the seventeenth.

In the absence, then, of more conclusive evidence, I feel bound to identify "my Lords the Bishops at Ely House" with the official committee of eight, and not with the unofficial trio of the preceding weeks. I would suggest that the Durham Book embodies the proposals for revision of Cosin and Wren, thrashed out between them in 1660-1; that the Fair Copy embodies the same proposals at a later stage in the proceedings, being the Durham Book amended for presentation to Convocation, probably as the result of its authors' conversations with Sheldon in November 1661; that it was in fact presented to the Convocation committee of eight bishops to whom the two communion offices had been "left to censure", and that the revised order was by them rejected: in other words, that it was brought to the attention of the highest synodical authority of the Church of England, and by that authority rejected formally and canonically. The significance of that rejection I hope to consider in a future article.

W. Jardine Grisbrooke.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Annan is Provost of King's College, Cambridge.

Mr Paul, who was Director of Studies at Brasted Place from 1953 to 1957, is the author of *The Meaning of Human Existence, Angry Young Man,* etc.

Mr Jackson is Head of the Sheffield Industrial Mission.

Mr Grisbrooke is a Junior Fellow in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Edinburgh.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

LETTER FROM SOUTH-EAST ASIA

DEAR SIR,

At the end of his excellent and illuminating account of the growth towards closer constitutional association of the dioceses in this part of the world, the Dean of Hong Kong refers to the terms of my appointment. He speaks of it as "a curiously nuncio-like arrangement whereby one bishop was 'responsible' for the affairs of another diocese to a distant metropolitan".

Dean Till has read too much into the words in which my appointment was announced. The Archbishop of Canterbury alone has metropolitical responsibility for the dioceses under his jurisdiction in South-East Asia, and under that jurisdiction the bishops have sole authority in their dioceses. I have no right or desire to infringe on that authority.

Archbishop Fisher's purpose was solely to improve the lines of communication between Lambeth and this part of the world, to have someone who, without coming in any way between the bishops and their metropolitan, would yet be able to keep him advised of the developing pattern of things in this complex area as a whole. Thus my first duty was to send a report explaining the background and setting forth the reasons which led to the passing of the resolution at Rangoon last February, to which Dean Till refers. So far from its being "another line of approach" towards a province in South-East Asia, the added commission was intended to be just a means of helping to find a solution to constitutional problems agreeable to all.

While I am writing, may I commend to those interested in developments in this area the article by the Bishop of Rangoon, "South-East Asia Council and Province", in the July 1961 number of *East and West Review*? It raises the important question whether it is possible to have a province of traditional pattern in the closer-knit area of Burma, Malaya and Borneo without damaging the fellowship experienced in the larger fellowship of the South-East Asia Council.

Yours faithfully,

✠ KENNETH SINGAPORE AND MALAYA.

THE DEVIL

DEAR SIR,

In reply to Don Cupitt's "Four Arguments against the Devil", may I make four replies—not, I hasten to add, as the Devil's Advocate but because denying his existence, if he exists, may considerably advance his cause.

(1) The practical ill-effects of a belief, like moral evasion, do not necessarily falsify it. I need not evade responsibility for my wrong-

doing by admitting that others tempt and influence me for the bad. God does not tempt me to sin (surely), but people do. Why should not the Devil as well? No one *makes* me do wrong (normally), but someone may sway me: yet I am still to blame for letting myself be swayed.

(2) If we rightly drop the "God of the gaps" and put theological explanation on another level from scientific, why not do the same for the Devil? Just as a psychological interpretation of religious experience will not invalidate its objectivity as an encounter with God, so also a psychological interpretation of mental disease will not rule out diabolical agency. I may exert my Lordship over creation by using science to save my cows and *thus* shame the Devil!

(3) Belief in the Devil does indeed entail a dualism, but this is harmless enough, provided God the Creator be allowed supreme: final victory may be his in this world. The existence of man, as wilful sinner, raises an equally anomalous dualism. Further, the classic theory of the atonement has at least this merit, that it takes seriously (if obscurely) the evil rooted in the world's structure as well as that directly in ourselves. "Tragic destiny", "fate", "the cussedness of things" bear witness to a demonic element which cannot be resolved simply into individual wickedness without remainder. Whose personal fault is war, hunger, disease, etc.? The Cross discloses the Devil's malice as well as mine.

(4) Even if we accept that evil is a deprivation of being, the Devil raises no problem when, as traditionally conceived, he is thought of as a fallen creature. As created he is good, as rebel against God he is bad. Sinful yet created man is just as metaphysically difficult. Moreover, with Origen, why not accept the implication that the Devil is capable of redemption—as also, perhaps, St Paul does (Col. 1. 20).

The sole, positive reason for the Devil's existence rests on the irreducibility of the demonic from the core of N.T. mythology. If N.T. language denotes metaphysical reality when speaking of God and heaven, consistency requires a similar grounding *in re* for the language of demons. Christianity is a revealed religion, revealing information about the unseen. The Devil is part of this, however successful he may at times be in conjuring away his own existence.

Yours faithfully,

D. G. Attfield.

9 Lyttelton Road,
Edgbaston,
Birmingham, 16.

THE MOTHERS' UNION

Dear Sir,

I write as a Diocesan President of the Mothers' Union, an office which I am proud to bear, and not as yet another bishop's wife.

Our Society has recently been a target for many criticisms, both from within and without the Church. In no way do we claim to be

perfect, and we are aware of our many shortcomings and of our inadequacy to fulfil the task which we believe to be ours. One of our weaknesses is evidently our failure to make ourselves known, so that many of the criticisms are made in ignorance of the true facts.

Both the Bishop of Exeter, in the address to his Diocesan Conference last year, and the Bishop of Bedford in THEOLOGY, have explained our principles and function more clearly than I could ever do. We are most grateful to them for this, and would leave further discussion with Mr James in their hands. But I would beg to point out, in reply to the letter from Dr and Mrs Charles-Edwards, that the publicly proclaimed policy of the Mothers' Union is to encourage our members to have the utmost compassion for those who have suffered from divorce, and to help them in every way possible. They are not debarred from the fellowship of our many open meetings or Young Wives' Groups, but, if we admit them as members by inventing for them a more "broad-minded" set of promises, a society of married women within the Church, which has always stood for life-long union, would be withdrawing from a form of witness which is certainly no less needed to-day than in the past. Perhaps, indeed, this witness is needed more to-day for the very reason that readmission to Communion is thought by many to signify the Church's approval of remarriage after divorce. Having looked again at the Regulations on Marriage and Divorce, passed by the Convocations in 1957, I cannot, as an unskilled lay-person, extract this meaning from them (*pace* Mr James).

I know that some readers will, provoked by my remarks, immediately produce instances of what they consider to be harsh treatment of individuals by members of the Mothers' Union. May I remind such critics that the Mothers' Union cannot hold itself responsible for the behaviour of every one of its half-million members?

In almost every discussion on marriage, principles are apt to be confused by individual cases. Because we hold to our principles, we do not thereby harden our hearts. But, while giving help and friendship to many who cannot join our Society, we are doing our utmost to fulfil the purposes of the Mothers' Union, namely, to strengthen, safeguard and promote Christian family life on the basis of the life-long nature of the marriage vows, as taught by the Church. With this purpose in mind, we would once more quote from the Encyclical Letter which prefaces the Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1958:

"Realizing that no family can achieve true depth except through the firm assurance of a steadfast faithfulness, we reaffirm the permanence of the marriage bond."

Yours faithfully,

URITH M. CARPENTER,
Diocesan President of the Mothers' Union (Oxford Diocese).

12 RAWLINSON ROAD,
OXFORD.

DEAR SIR,

Many parish priests must have welcomed the article by the Rev. Eric James, and subsequent correspondence. But are we not in danger of avoiding the real issue? It is not the Mothers' Union that needs a reformation, but the official mind of the Church of England. It is not those in authority at Mary Sumner House who need to interpret the phrase "the sanctity of marriage" more liberally, but those who are in authority in the Church. The Bishop of Bedford speaks truly when he says that the Mothers' Union does not determine the Church's doctrine on marriage. It merely witnesses to it, and therefore the fair and proper way to change the Mothers' Union (if that is desired) is to change the outlook of the Church first.

It is all very well for Mr James to recall that the Church in 1887, as in previous generations, has celebrated the re-marriage of divorced folk. But we live in 1961, and there is no doubt that the official view nowadays, as expressed in public pronouncements and Convocation rules, is against more liberal practice. The Mothers' Union claim that it is expressing the mind of the Church is a fair one, at the moment. The admission of divorced folk to Holy Communion in no way weakens their case, for even in the eyes of most bishops any new union entered into is bound to be viewed as an adulterous union. It is just not true that the bishops are more liberal on this matter than the Mothers' Union.

There are three positive steps that we parish priests can take at the moment, and in none of them need we feel morally "in the dog house".

(1) We can campaign ceaselessly and openly by all the means within our power for a change in the official attitude of the Church.

(2) Having the courage of our convictions and the support of the Law, we can with discretion re-marry certain divorced folk in our parish churches.

(3) As an interim measure, and until the official view of the Church changes, we can take more seriously the admission that the Mothers' Union is not meant to be *the* Women's Organization of the Church. It is pastorally unfair and misguided to disband Mothers' Union branches, but we can give them the competition which they, and our parishes, so badly need. If our parishes have another flourishing women's organization in their lives, call it what we may but open to all, not only will many more women be attracted to the work of the Church but those thousands who have hitherto joined the Mothers' Union less out of conviction than because there is no other body to offer them fellowship will be able to work for the Church without hypocrisy. The Mothers' Union will then be reduced to what the Bishop of Bedford claims it always has been—a strictly limited class making a distinctive witness, rather like the Anglican Pacifist Fellowship.

Yours sincerely,
DAVID A. EDWARDS.

ST NICOLAS RECTORY,
FOG LANE,
MANCHESTER, 19.

"THE MEANING OF SACRED SCRIPTURE"

DEAR REVEREND SIR,

In his review of my book, *The Meaning of Sacred Scripture*, in your July issue, Dr Cunliffe-Jones writes: "The omission of the first three gospels from sustained treatment is very odd." What is very odd indeed is that Dr Cunliffe-Jones has been able apparently to read my book without even noticing that two full chapters (15 and 16) are devoted to that sustained treatment, while one half at least of chapter 21 is again on the teaching of the Synoptic gospels.

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS BOUYER,
Of the Oratory.

16 RUE BEETHOVEN,
STRASBOURG.

"THE RECONSTRUCTION OF BELIEF"

DEAR SIR,

Dr T. A. Roberts, in his review of Gore's *Reconstruction of Belief*, remarks that since the bishop's death theology "has moved into the post-Liberal era, and the great Liberal belief in the reasonableness of religion is contemptuously dismissed", and adds that "'Faith' and 'Belief' are now the magic words". But how is the "reasonableness" of religion to be demonstrated? It may well be that there is more than one way of doing so, since "reasonable" is a word patient of a variety of interpretations: what is reasonable in one age may appear merely fanciful in another; a sound opinion to me may be no more than credulity to my neighbour. There is no absolute definition; which is why the Church's apologetic task is never ending. In the moral sphere, where personal impression and private judgment are the final arbiters, such changeableness is inevitable, and it is idle to lament it. But it means that Christianity can have no conclusive intellectual vindication.

Gore's own ill-success in the *Reconstruction* is illustrative; his method was out of date even when he wrote. And Dr Roberts, in bidding us—if I read him aright—go back to the "rational" arguments of the Liberals (though was Gore a Liberal?), himself gives us little encouragement from his criticism of what the bishop had actually tried to do. For if the truth of Christianity is to be proved by the sort of rational means which Dr Roberts seems to want, then these can only be the familiar metaphysical and historical ones: i.e. does God exist? and did the miracle of the Incarnation really occur? Yet linguistic philosophy, Dr Roberts's trust in which is evidently undiminished, despite the second thoughts which linguistic philosophers themselves are now certainly beginning to have, has however left little room for a metaphysical answer to the first—at least in any form which traditional theism would find congenial—and it is difficult to see how the technical historian, on the basis of the available evidence, could, in the case of the second, be expected to arrive at an estimate of Christian origins which would require

the inferences that orthodox belief has drawn therefrom. We are, in fact, thrown back, as ever, upon the assurance not of "reason" but of "faith". But whether such faith is itself reasonable is another question, calling for a different kind of approach. What the modern apologist has to ask himself is why—apart from the constraint of mere custom—men to-day do "profess and call themselves Christions"? And the reply is, I venture to think, that they do so, not as having been persuaded by historical or metaphysical arguments—to which, as I find, the ordinary churchgoer is usually indifferent—but from the inward satisfaction derived from acceptance of the Christian "values": i.e., as I understand it, the spiritual or moral truth for which the Church's dogma stands. A modern apologist therefore will be more concerned to analyse the nature of Christian experience, which even in this secularist age many still are keenly aware of sharing, than to urge reasons for believing in "external" facts the authenticity of which is incapable of proof or of which the meaning, when taken in a literal sense, leads only to an incoherence of thought.

Indeed, in my view, this is more than a mere work of apology—unhappy word! It is surely, in the circumstances of our time, the true job of the theologian. The received dogma is no longer, at any rate in Protestant communions, capable of further elaboration, and in its traditional form has become a stylized symbolism the implications of which are not apparent to the plain man. To interpret that symbolism in terms of what the modern believer (or would-be believer) can hope to comprehend is what remains for us to do. After all, where Gore himself spoke with conviction was where he revealed what faith meant for *him*. The value of the *Reconstruction* lies not in its obsolete argumentation but in its passionate moral seriousness.

Yours faithfully,
B. M. G. Reardon.

Parham Rectory,
Pulborough, Sussex.

[The editor thanks correspondents for many other letters which he regrets it is not possible to publish.]

BOOK REVIEWS

The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy. By S. J. P. van Dijk, O.F.M., and J. Hazelden Walker. Darton, Longmans and Todd. 70s.

We have been accustomed for some time to look to Fr S. van Dijk for instruction and illumination in the field of medieval Latin liturgy. His many articles and essays, scattered over as many periodicals, have bred a hope for some larger work in which his more im-

portant themes might receive plenary treatment. Such a work, written in collaboration with Dr J. H. Walker, is here before us. Its subject, precisely defined in the sub-title as "The Liturgy of the Papal Court and the Franciscan Order in the thirteenth century" is that particular development in the history of the Roman Office and Mass which lies at the foundation of the modern Breviary and Missal.

Apart from its intrinsic importance and interest, the subject touches Fr van Dijk's filial piety. In the last years of the fourteenth century, Ralph van der Beke (or Radulphus de Rivo), dean of the collegiate church of Tongres, charged the Friars Minor with contributing to the overthrow of the pure and ancient Roman Office by adopting the Office of the Papal Curia in the debased and abbreviated form given to it by Pope Innocent III, and further with propagating the Curial Office in a form still more debased by abbreviation, and by alteration and omission, so that the old Roman Office had been suppressed and "to-day in Rome all the books are new and Franciscan". Ralph's statements have been widely credited. But why, ask Fr van Dijk and his collaborator, should Ralph be believed, and the early Franciscan and contemporary of Innocent, Fr Salimbene de Adam of Parma, be ignored? According to Salimbene, Innocent had introduced some definite improvement into the Office, albeit leaving parts of it "more wearisome than devotional" for everyone concerned. The Office was still too long, and had "many things in it that could be put right". Nevertheless, Innocent had left the Office better than he found it.

What is the truth of the matter? And what exactly was the Innocentian reform? Did the Friars Minor adopt the Office of Innocent's chapel? The answers which the two authors give to these questions contradict those proposed half a century ago by Batiffol and Bäumer. The situation has been changed by the discovery of documents unknown to either of these scholars. A copy, the only one known to be extant, of Innocent III's Ordinarium was found in Paris close on forty years ago; and in 1941 Fr van Dijk himself recognized in a Franciscan Breviary and Missal preserved in a library at Padua, and written in a script so minute as to discourage any but the most dogged reader, the Office and Mass Ordinaria composed, at the order of Pope Innocent IV, by Haymo of Faversham, the fourth Minister General of the Friars Minor. Haymo's work points to the existence of earlier Franciscan liturgical books; and it was of these, and not of Roman books (as Wadding supposed) that Haymo was the corrector, according to the argument of Fr van Dijk and his co-author.

The history, as the authors reconstruct it, is too complicated for summary. Only one or two matters can be noticed. Originally St Francis had no thought of Office-saying, and certainly had not wished his friars to mar their poverty by the possesssion even of an Office-book. But the priests who joined his company desired to say an Office. In consequence, Francis's first Rule allowed the use of the Office "secundum consuetudinem clericorum Romane ecclesie", and permitted possession of the necessary books. The authors take this

concession to mean that St Francis's priests were "to follow the Office of the papel chapel as revised by Innocent III", which was the use of the diocese of Assisi, and of which, therefore, Francis already knew something. According to the third Rule, Franciscan clerics were to say the Roman Office, i.e. the Curial Office, with the "Gallican" in place of the "Roman" Psalter, "*ex quo* habere poterunt breviaria". The interpretation of the words in italic has been the subject of much discussion. The authors propose the meaning "because", on the ground that the possession of Office-books, which had been conceded in the earlier Rule, led to the obligation of reciting Office by Franciscan as by other clerics. Contrary to Francis's intention, the friars were in process of becoming an Order of monastic type, a transformation in which the authors discern the influence of Francis's friend, Cardinal Hugolin de' Conti, afterwards Pope Gregory IX. It was fortunate that Francis had chosen for his friars the Office of the papal chapel. Innocent III's reform, although inevitably retaining the monastic shape of the Office, and therewith much inconvenience for non-monastic clerics who used it, was nevertheless (in Cranmer's phrase) "a greate deale more profitable and commodious, than that whiche of late was vsed". What is true of the Office and Breviary is true also of the Mass and Missal. "The liturgical reform initiated by Innocent III within his own chapel," conclude the authors, "started a revival of public worship which was to gather momentum throughout the thirteenth century. His immediate successors, Honorius III and Gregory IX, saw beyond the palace walls, the latter dreaming of the whole western world, apart from the monks and Canons Regular, united in the liturgy of his court." The proper objects of Radulphus de Rivo's complaint were (if we accept the authors' argument) not the Friars Minor, but the occupants of the Roman See; and the complaint itself was perverse and unjustified.

Enough has been said to indicate the nature and contents of *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*. It is a monument to the authors' learning and industry. There is an appendix containing forty-two illustrative documents with *apparatus critici*; and the index of manuscripts occupies six pages. Some of the authors' positions may require further defence and others modification, and not all cases are conclusively proved, although persuasively presented; but the book remains a contribution of signal importance to the study of the medieval Roman liturgy. The publishers are to be congratulated on the admirable printing and on the photography of the eighteen plates. There is one curious and often repeated error of spelling: the word "ordinance" is deprived of its "i".

Edward C. Ratcliff.

Cambridge.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF SAINT AUGUSTINE. By Etienne Gilson. Translated by L. E. M. Lynch. Victor Gollancz. 1961. 42s.

Prof. Gilson published his *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustin* in 1929, when he had already established his reputation as the most distinguished living student of medieval thought. In the Preface he explained that it was the constant appeal to St Augustine by the scholastic philosophers that had compelled him to "go back to the source, and to study the Augustinism of St Augustine himself in order to be in a position to understand that of his successors". Thus when the jacket advertisement of the present translation informs us that the famous author of *The Christian Philosophy of St Thomas Aquinas* "now turns to the Christian philosophy of St Augustine", the statement is one that would have been sufficiently accurate thirty years ago.

The translation has been made from the second (revised) edition published in 1943; and Gilson has contributed a new Foreword in which he relates the theological authority of St Thomas for the Catholic to the work of "the one doctor of the Church whose theological authority he never lost sight of". "One could not do away with Saint Augustine without parting company with Saint Thomas Aquinas. . . . The Church asks us to go to Thomas. This does not mean that we are not to go to Augustine."

The English title, however, makes it clear that what we are to expect is not an account of Augustine's Christian doctrine, but an exposition of the "different philosophical language" in which Augustine expressed "the same religious truth" for which Aquinas was to employ the philosophical technique of Aristotle. So we are invited to follow Augustine's Three Ways of search for God, as the Light of the mind, the Inspirer and Director of the will, and the Creator of the external world. Throughout, Gilson keeps close to the discourse of his author. The full references to Augustine's Latin which in the original were given in footnotes have been reproduced, less conveniently for the reader, at the end of the book. We are shown how the Christian Platonist was compelled to do violence to his philosophical teacher at one point after another in the Plotinian system. And in a final chapter on "Augustinism" the journey of Augustine's mind from doubt to faith is sketched with a masterly hand, and the characteristics which mark any form of Christian thinking as "Augustinian" are unerringly distinguished.

In the *Confessions* Augustine tells the story of his own conversion. The *City of God* is the projection of his personal experience upon the history of the world, torn as his soul had been torn between two loves. "Reduced to the bare essentials," writes Gilson, "which belong to no race or time, St Augustine *is* man—man in his will to be sufficient to himself and his powerlessness to do without God. . . . Since the dark forces which give birth to the drama he relates are implicit in every living heart, it is the pride and the wretchedness of each one of us that he confesses. Hence the universality of his

doctrine is as notable as its individuality. Metaphysic of his own conversion as it is, Augustine's doctrine remains *par excellence* the metaphysic of conversion."

St Augustine himself, I think, would not have approved any account of his own philosophy which might seem to centre it upon man or man's experience. He would have preferred to call his metaphysic the metaphysic of creative goodness. Here are his own words, from the great commentary on the biblical narrative of creation. "Man is not a thing so made that if his Maker leaves him alone he can do anything well of himself. . . . The turning of a man to the Lord does not mean that when God has given him righteousness he can go away, but that his righteousness must be continually in the making. . . . Let him then whose goodness is changeless work and watch over the goodness of men. We must submit ourselves to his continual making, his continual perfecting, cleaving to him and remaining always in that state of conversion towards him, of which it is written: 'It is good for me to hold me fast by God.' "

J. Burnaby.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Common Sense about Christian Ethics. By Edward Carpenter. Gollancz. 1961. 12s. 6d. and 6s.

When a woman boasts of having an instinct, or when an Englishman appeals to common sense, mere males and lesser breeds without the law may begin to feel their hackles rise, and suspect that they will be imposed upon. Sometimes, indeed, a fast one is pulled. But sometimes also, as now, a miracle occurs. We get that eclectic-instinctive non-logical yet consistent empirical yet ideal blend of liberal traditionalism, humanitarian justice and inspired common sense which is produced by the best type of Englishman (or Chinese, or Frenchman, or even by the Teutonic Erasmus).

Canon Edward Carpenter seems to have read everything relevant —among others he quotes the Bible, Plato, the Fathers and schoolmen, Latimer, Laud, Butler, Kant, Dibelius, Maurice, Temple and Niebuhr. His style and thought are very lucid and interesting and pointed—he seldom lapses into the vague summary generalities for which he apologizes, and which are so unavoidable in a small book on a big subject.

"Anglicans" need his warning against a too complacent comprehensiveness which accepts too lightly and irresponsibly the inevitability of tensions and disagreements. Yet he does not go to the other extreme, and insist on a piano imitating a voice and being either treble or bass—he tries to play his piano with both hands. He partly rejects the "Realistic Ethics" of Temple and Niebuhr (who say that, since ideals are unattainable while still relevant, we must be content to compromise with the half-loaf of justice when we cannot rise to the full height of love). He prefers an "Ethic of Commitment" by which each person makes the response, appropriate, and

possible, to his particular historical situation. He is not too fond of abstract generalities, insisting that being is personal, and insisting too on the great theological fact of the Holy Trinity. We wish this fruitful idea, derived from F. D. Maurice, could be worked out in all its implications. Along with that, he insists on the concreteness and particularity of the Bible. And here we see what true biblical theology is (as distinguished from the abstract propositional and juridically dogmatic affirmations of the mere biblicist). To be truly biblical involves having an historical sense, and putting moral practice and theory into its historical context, investing it with all that makes it personal and particular. So a large part of the book is given to show us various ethical views against their historical background.

We may describe this type of ethical theory as "existential" and at the same time empirical. It is "non-propositional": in other words, conduct is more a practical result of character and inspiration than a product of philosophical theory. It is Pascal's "esprit de finesse" rather than his "esprit de géométrie". It is not irrational or illogical, but it knows that we may use intuition as well as reason. It is what Bergson would call an open (not closed) morality. It is a courageous attempt to escape from the vague generalities of most ethical theory, and to pick out the characteristically Christian Ethic, which is interested above all in persons and their motives.

Canon Carpenter's eclecticism is discriminating, yet it has perhaps been a little too wide, so as to confuse his single-mindedness. In the last chapter, he deals with "Christian Ethics and contemporary society"—in reference to problems such as divorce, homosexuality, A.I.D., apartheid, advertising, gambling and hydrogen bombs. The author warns us that his application is intended "more to illustrate the nature of the problem than to provide cut and dried answers", and thus anticipates those critics who will declare that his trumpet gives a rather uncertain sound.

Do we calumniate Canon Carpenter when we congratulate him on achieving the impossible? Has he expressed in common sense and English that thing which seems the most remote from either—the Ethical theory given in Karl Barth's *Dogmatik*, or something very closely akin to it? We do not accuse him of having read that volume, any more than we accuse him of reading right through the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. But it may, in fact it must, by various devious and indirect routes have infiltrated into his mind. It is not a nice thing to say about an Englishman or about an Anglican, and so we shall make the suggestion hypothetical and put it purely as a question.

Cosslett Quin.

Billis Rectory,
Co. Cavan.

CHRISTIANS AND POWER POLITICS. By Alan Booth. S.C.M. Press. 1961. 6s.

This little paper-back has a value out of all proportion to its modest size. It questions radically the pious platitudes and abstract moralizing that so often pass as Christian judgments. It cuts like a knife through the thick atmosphere of a slogan-ridden world in which an obdurate self-righteousness makes every issue seem to be a conflict between God and the devil.

The three key questions which are considered are the conflict between East and West, of Moscow and New York; the grim problems of nuclear power and the implications of "a balance of terror"; and, thirdly, the involvement of Europe in Africa.

If the first issue is the East-West conflict, the third is the North-South involvement, and the two are dangerously intertwined. A study of the conflict of powers leads to some consideration of a Christian approach to politics and government. Very frankly the author points out that the demand for religious freedom does not always recognize that the preaching of the gospel may seem to be disruptive and that Christian witness may often demand a condition not of privileged utterance but of helplessness and suffering. Mr Booth insists that the clash between the two great power systems is not to be regarded as simply a clash between Christian forces and their opposite, and "we have precisely to exert this constant and costly effort to prevent the West arrogating to itself the style of 'Christian' ".

The second section on military power and mass destruction is sombre enough, but the author keeps his head and suggests that the contemplation of apocalyptic warfare can easily inhibit the careful judgments needed to avoid it. The chief sources of peril are isolated and possible steps towards survival are suggested. The prohibition of nuclear tests, the control of ballistic missiles and the recognition that an economy in conventional weapons by the affluent societies may make a push-button war more likely are carefully argued. Pacifists will not like the suggestion that conventional rearmament might reduce the danger of a nuclear war through lack of any alternative. Due weight is given to the possibility of the use of emergency forces under the control of the United Nations. The theology of power is faced and fundamental questions asked. Faced with a clear choice between political surrender and a holocaust there can be no doubt that suicide is never justified, but to abandon a struggle for a just world because it is dangerous is quite another matter. But men are dangerous when they are afraid, and the contribution of the Christian may well be to free men from fear that they may be able patiently and perseveringly to remove the weeds from our human garden. In a world become small, where "a sneeze in any corner of the world reverberates", the Church has to contribute a new community as a prophetic adumbration of the reality we strive for, but "a church which . . . adds to human conflicts the additional burdens of denominational division and national ecclesiastical isolation is

depriving humanity of the sign of hope it is entitled to look for from the bearer of the gospel".

The section on the clash of races is interesting and provides more than one rather original insight. Nationalism in its extreme form and various types of racial segregation are attempts to preserve oneself, and groups have a certain right to be themselves without interference, but logically such movements are not so much forms of wickedness as of delusion in the sort of world which God is bringing into being. Actually "we are being freed into relationships which we cannot avoid and which demand a sacrificial readiness to bear one another's burdens . . . a form of isolationism is not possible to-day because God has closed that door".

There is in this book a very helpful blend of practical policies and theological understanding and a realism which one might expect from one who is secretary of the Churches' Commission on International Affairs. It should provide a very useful basis for the sort of study circles most needed amongst Christian people.

Leonard M. Schiff.

St Augustine's College,
Canterbury.

Eastern Christendom. By Nicolas Zernov. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1961. 42s.

This is the third in a new series on the history of religion edited by E. O. James, fully illustrated and magnificently produced. The illustrations are not only of architecture, including some admirable photographs of the formal beauty of Byzantine exteriors in Serbia, and of the complex forms of cupola in Russia, but also of ikons in their relation to Egyptian funerary painting, of modern liturgical scenes, and of portraits of personalities in the recent past, including the present patriarchs of Constantinople and Moscow.

The history is planned as leading directly to the present situation, and for this reason a generous part is given to the Turkish period in the history of the older churches, and to Russia since the fall of Kiev. This occupies more than half the historical section of two hundred pages in seven chapters. At the end, over sixty pages in four chapters are given to doctrine, worship, the life of the Church and religious art. The notes at the end are slight but the bibliography is generous, and this is sometimes expanded into what is in effect an important note correcting the balance of the text, as on pp. 309–10 on Islamic civilization. Unfortunately, in this part of the work, the proof-reading, especially in punctuation, leaves much to be desired. This sometimes obscures a reference.

In the first two chapters, which cover ground familiar to readers of Theology, some slips in detail will be noticed, as in the list of bishops appointed to be umpires of orthodoxy in 381, where two Antiochs seem to be confused, and in the accounts of Ephesus and Chalcedon. I do not think that these need impair our confidence in

the general balance of Dr Zernov's judgment in later and less familiar phases, where he has made good use of the works of Dvornik and Runciman on the history of the schism and of the Crusades. In the Kievan period of Russian history he is aware of Western as well as of Byzantine influences, but ascribes too much originality to the humanitarian ideals of Russian princes. Reluctance to inflict capital punishment, for instance, was by no means unknown in Byzantium. It is good to have so much on the Ottoman empire, but it may be that Dr Zernov's knowledge of the difficulties and dilemmas of Christian life at this time leads him to read these too far back into the long ages of Christian endurance under Moslem military control. I do not think that the history of the attempts at union between East and West in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries can be read without some consideration of the attitude of Christian communities already cut off from both Rome and Byzantium by the Moslem "iron curtain". These suffered much from the suspicion that they might act as a fifth column in a new crusade, and yet knew that the success of such an operation would reduce them to the dependent existence of their neighbours in Cyprus and the other Venetian and Genoese dependencies in Latin Greece. This is by far the most important non-theological factor in the final failure of these attempts, and it can only be understood in the light of experience of Moslem rule before the Crusades. Christians could still hope that the Turks would become not so very different from the Arabs

In his treatment of theological differences between East and West, Dr Zernov rightly concentrates on the two ideas of the Church as shown in the corporate life of the two communities, and in their very different kinds of liturgy and art. On the theological nuances in Byzantine and Russian ikons he has succeeded in collecting some very penetrating and important comments. But he does not relate these or the *filioque* to the difference in the doctrine of the Trinity. On this more strictly theological question his reserve is less illuminating, and, I think, less characteristically Byzantine than the daring of Philip Sherrard in *The Greek East and the Latin West.* Nor does he explore the Byzantine conception of the role of the Pope and the other Patriarchs in the life of their own church. In his account of worship he takes the iconostasis for granted, but this was less solid in the formative period. Needless to say there is much that is illuminating in this book, more especially in the accounts of the infiltration of Western influences into Eastern theological education after the schism, but this is a book to open questions, not to establish definitive conclusions.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

THE LIFE OF RAYMOND RAYNES. By Nicholas Mosley. Faith Press. 1961. 25s.

THE FAITH. Instructions on the Christian Faith. By Raymond Raynes, C.R. Edited by Nicholas Mosley. Faith Press. 1961. 5s.

Mr Mosley's Life of Raymond Raynes is to be welcomed as a measurable and readable contribution to the history of the Church in South Africa, and as a candid account of a memorable period in the life of the Community of which he was for so long Superior. As a piece of South African church history it provides the necessary background preface and sequel to *Naught for your Comfort*, as well as the elucidation of that book. It is a relief to be quite certain of the reasons for Fr Huddleston's recall.

Fr Raynes was a tempestuous and powerful force, deriving his effectiveness from total consecration. He was himself one of those he described as "the violent who enter the Kingdom and serve", and it is the violence of his heroic spirituality that predominates in this biography and lingers in the memory. He burnt himself out in a meteoric course. From the moment he found his vocation as a religious the inner logic of his soul compelled him to destroy himself.

Yet here we face a query, which this Life fails, though only just fails, to answer. Was his self-immolation the compulsion of pure love, or was it partly the compulsion exerted on a soul never perfectly integrated? There are hints of the latter possibility. We miss the massive tranquillity and self-mastery of a great religious, and we miss that discretion. He was frankly naughty about deserting the Community so often. There is also the fact, and I believe this biography entitles us to give it the status of a fact, that his vocation was partly born of a somewhat negative, wrong-headed and short-sighted contempt for the mere "parson with a job", as he put it. He grew out of it, but I believe his lack of final integration is traceable in some measure to this initial flaw in his vision of the priesthood and understanding of vocation.

Yet he was no fanatic in the gloomy sense, and his biographer has produced a faithful and attractive picture of a variously gifted and many-sided apostle. He knew the world, and how to cope with its ugly ways: he was a match for the nastiest city councillor. But he loved the world as a creation of God and knew the depth of its heartbreak. He tried hard to be all things to all men, and though not a scholar succeeded astonishingly in the winning of intellectuals. He abhorred convention and loved to surprise and shock. "How would you approach the drink problem?" he was asked, coming out of a doze at a meeting. "With a corkscrew," he replied. He also liked to cultivate the opposite attraits of his soul. He could be silent yet hilarious, funny and fierce, tender and terrible, doubtful yet determined, and each in turn for the love of Christ who mastered him. He ruled and invigorated the Community of the Resurrection at a critical time in its history. It is a pity he ended by exasperating it.

The biography suffers considerably from the lack of an index, the

omission of chapter headings, and too many misprints, which are noted on pp. 99, l. 29; 114, l. 17; 116, l. 29; 161, l. 29; 164, l. 34; 173, l. 4; 214, l. 35; 216, l. 5; 217, l. 27; 224, l. 11; 263, l. 23; 278, l. 2; 279, l. 24.

The second book under review consists of twenty addresses delivered by Fr Raynes during a fortnight's mission at St Michael's, Denver, Colorado, in October 1957, less than a year before his death, when already a sick man. They were taken down and edited by Mr Mosley, one of Fr Raynes's own converts.

In the fifth of these, on "What shall I do with Jesus?" he says, "You cannot separate a person from what he does and says and thinks and endures." The same condition must govern any assessment of his addresses. As they stand they resemble a musical score waiting to be brought to life by a living voice. The slapdash, the non sequiturs, the naive and even naughty exegesis, all fall into place against the perspective of his total personality. They move from the sublime to the silly, and the tremendous to the trite. None the less, they will prove useful for the recent or potential convert. Two memorable statements remain in the mind: our Lord "catholicized the Church" at the Last Supper; and "with the spread of the Church the earth is being girdled with the Eucharist". A misprint is noted on p. 99, l. 1.

J. K. Byrom.

Cheadle Hulme.

The Bishop in Church. By Patrick Ferguson-Davie. S.P.C.K. 1961. 35s.

This instructive book comes to us with a Commendation from the Bishop of Exeter, an Introduction by the Principal of St Stephen's House, Oxford, and a Preface and Explanatory Note by the author, all of which suggest that ecclesiastical winds are likely to blow us towards ever greater simplicity in church services. "The prelate of a hundred years ago," remarks Fr Couratin, "behaved in church as simply as he dressed. Clothed in the sober yet sumptuous fashion prescribed by English tradition, he merely needed the attendance of a single chaplain, who could hold his cap, his prayer book, and perhaps his gloves." "At the present time," says the author, "no book about ceremonial can enjoy a very long life . . . a liturgical revolution is taking place." One can see the difficulties, but can still wish that an expert so admirably qualified as he is had felt able to emulate in ceremonial reform the boldness of the Roman Catholic authorities at Aberdeen in church furniture.

The book perhaps exaggerates the number of dioceses in which bishops or clergy find the situation ceremonially as complex as its author expects. The "word or two in the vestry before the service", to which the Bishop of Exeter refers, contents more bishops than one would think and on the whole with some pragmatic justification. But situations do arise where bishops would like to know more

clearly at least what to object to and, more often, what advice to give, in order to secure that services and their part in them may proceed smoothly and without fuss or irritation. Such a book as this provides them with a quarry from which they may extract principles on the basis of which such rules and directions as they think suitable to their own dioceses may be formulated.

Fr Couratin remarks that one aim of the book is to omit the "otiose and the confusing". Both he and the author have a thoroughly up-to-date dislike of the staff and mitre—"they bedevil episcopal ceremonies". How swiftly turns the whirligig of fashion, for these have only really "come in" in the last twenty-five years or so. Now, just as everybody has taken to wearing them, except for a few determined evangelicals mostly in Africa or America, they may well be on the way out again!

Some simplification there indeed is in this book, but surely there could be much more. Take the mitre and the staff themselves, for example. They are the bishop's hat and walking-stick: Fr Ferguson-Davie rightly advises against their use for the Absolution in the Communion Service; but are they really needed at all except to take off when you come into the house and put on when you go out? And would one really put one's hat on in the house to read a letter? Yet (p. 81) the bishop is still advised to put on his mitre for the Epistle. Then there is the business of preaching a sermon, wearing a mitre. Is this usage really practicable? It would at most survive only a quiet talk in a country church. But a sermon! and an eloquent one at that! How swift the descent from the sublime to the ridiculous and how distracted the preacher and his audience by the all too obvious insecurity of his headgear.

But the author, with his wide knowledge and strong ceremonial sense, has put us all in his debt by this informative, detailed and well-laid-out book. Had it appeared earlier I might not have had to walk behind a high church bishop in my own cathedral and see him bestowing blessings right and left, leaving the diocesan to feel like Esau (Gen. 27. 38), though doubtless from a different standpoint.

The author is surely incorrect, so far as the 1661 book is concerned, in treating the "Collect for Purity" as a private devotion of the celebrant. Alike in the first printed edition and in the Sealed Books, the *Amen* to this prayer is in rubrical type.

✠ Glyn Landav:

Half Angels. By Elizabeth Montefiore. Faith Press. 1961. 8s. 6d.

This slender and eminently readable volume is that rare thing: a book not derived from other books, but from the pondering of a mature mind upon real life. That it has been enriched by wide reading in many fields is evident upon almost every page, for the writer took a First in English at Oxford and has since studied sociology and had much first-hand experience of various social groups.

She examines with clarity and insight the nature of love and the developing relationships within the family, beyond it with the outside world, and through both the child's relationship to God. She is fully alive to the power of the collective unconscious and acknowledges the increased insight which psychoanalysis has brought us, but all she says is informed by a sturdy common sense, which extends to her comments on the teaching of religion and the affairs of the Spirit: "It is conventional at Christmas to think of Jesus as poor and cold, one of the dispossessed. This is sentimental. He had all the riches that any human baby needs. Mary was there to keep him warm, fed and adored, Joseph to protect. He had a settled home. His foster father was not a labourer hired by the day, but an artisan." She has some wholesome things to say about sin and guilt and the effects of a wrong approach on children: "It is horribly easy to make children feel guilty by magnifying nuisances into sins, or withholding love. . . . Most of us suffer not from infamy but weakness. Scrabbling about in our sins will merely enfeeble us further. Strength and help come from God."

She has been well served by her unnamed illustrator, whose drawings are eloquent of many nuances of mood and situation which any parent will recognize with a smile, a pang or a sigh.

Many who are in touch with numbers of young married women are much concerned by the high incidence of neurosis in this group and by their apparent rejection of home-making as a satisfying activity, well exemplified by the recent series of articles in *The Observer*. It is indeed refreshing to encounter a woman who knows where she is going and why. "Our present world if unpredictable is at least not boring. To be a parent now is not a matter of routine or convention. It is not only to engage in an absorbing art, but also, along with the poets and artists, to renew the springs of our common life"; and, again, "To be a mother is to be responsible for a small piece of the pattern of civilization". Because she is sensitively aware of the importance of the oblique and the implicit and penetrates far beyond the superficialities of the mother's role, her vision of it should be particularly helpful to the number of women of education and ability who feel frustrated by the increasingly unskilled nature of the mechanics of their domestic routine.

Though primarily concerned with parents and the young spirits entrusted to their care and nurture, there is much in this wise and warm-hearted book which would be of value to a parish priest. For what is parish life but an extension of family life, with its interplay of personalities, its periods of stress, development and its deeply satisfying rewards; and are not the qualities of the good pastor identical with those of the good parent, not least the capacity to be infinitely available to real need, and ultimately, having provided the nourishment and environment essential to growth, able to stand aside and allow each soul to work out its own salvation?

VALÉRIE M. S. WATERSON.

STOKE D'ABERNON.

ANGLICAN DEVOTION. By C. J. Stranks. S.C.M. Press. 1961. 30s.

This book is difficult to review if only because five or six hundred words of praise tend to sound a little forced and unreal, yet praise is all I can honestly give it: it is the most readable, instructive and important work on Anglican spirituality we have had for many years. It must be carefully read—even the laudatory cliché is inevitable because for once it is true—by everyone who has any interest in pastoral questions. When it has been read, many a modern little booklet on prayer or pastoralia will be impatiently thrust aside in favour of solid Caroline thought with which this book mainly deals. The sub-title "Studies in the Spiritual Life of the Church of England between the Reformation and the Oxford Movement" is a little misleading, for it properly treats of only two writers later than Law and the whole is seen in terms of the seventeenth century and Prayer Book ideal.

A most prudent selection of subjects brings out every facet of this complex period and forms an admirable combination of famous and lesser known names and works. It is a stroke of genius to choose Wilberforce rather than Wesley to explain this strand of the tradition, and to bind the book together with a central chapter called "Devotion based on the Prayer Book". The result is a brilliant synthesis of variety and coherence.

By careful self-discipline, the author achieves exactly the right balance between plain introduction to the works and writers treated and his own expert comment upon them. We are *made* to re-read the Caroline authors, but armed with fresh insights and enthusiasm, which is the proper aim, so rarely achieved, of all books of this type. For example: how refreshing it is to be told, by an accepted expert on Jeremy Taylor, not to plough through *Ductor Dubitantium* but to take *Holy Living* seriously, paying due regard to the circumstances in which, and the people for whom, it was written. That illustrates the shrewd pastoral sense which is brought to bear on the whole subject. It is explained how Bayly's somewhat "old-fashioned" attitude to death is so much more practical than modern sentimental evasions; how the Church's real need to-day is a return to Traherne's doctrine of Creation; how one sentence in *The Whole Duty of Man* contains more theological common sense about gambling than pages and pages of modern reports. Probably more important still is the overall fact that Anglican pastoral practice is based not upon isolated sermons but upon preaching preceded by catechetical instruction and followed by spiritual direction.

I hope every parish priest in England will put this first on his list, it is essential to all serious students, not only of Caroline piety but of pastoral theology, and it is the best introduction to date for those less acquainted with the subject.

On the grounds that a sensible review of any book must contain some adverse criticism, I have spent the last week, on and off, trying to find something wrong with this one. The results are not very impressive: two words in the sub-title are slightly misleading yet

subtly correct, I hope that seven not very exciting illustrations have not added greatly to the price, though it is still worth every penny of it, and I hope that the importance of the book will not be missed because it is so delightfully easy to read.

MARTIN THORNTON, O.G.S.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE CALLING OF GOD. By J. G. Riddell. St Andrew Press. 1961. 21s.

THE WORD FOR THIS CENTURY. Edited by M. C. Tenney. Lutterworth Press. 1961. 15s.

CHRISTIANS AND THE CROWTHER REPORT. By Kathleen Bliss. National Society. 1961. 1s. 6d.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CHURCHES AND SCHOOLS. By R. G. K. Hickman. National Society. 1961. 1s. 6d.

HOW TO TEACH THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Edited by Jack Cottam and Edgar Stephenson. Faith Press. 1961. 10s. 6d.

According to a preface by a colleague, *The Calling of God* is the product of a "mind essentially orderly and systematizing rather than speculative". It deals with divine election—more especially as this is defined in the Westminster Confession and catechisms.

The author rejects the doctrine of predestination, as there stated, because it is based not on God's will as revealed in Christ but on God's hidden purpose before creation. He contends that an evangelist must believe that God calls all men, that Christ died for all, that "the starting point for the study of human nature is not the Garden of Eden but in Bethlehem, Nazareth, Galilee and Jerusalem . . . that man is made ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei goes back to the early chapters of the Bible but the clue to its meaning is in Him who is the image of the Godhead" (p. 79): that our adoption is the work of the Holy Spirit, that the worship of the church is its acknowledgment of the headship of Christ, that the Scriptures are read in order to encounter our Lord and the sacraments are celebrated to effect and sustain our incorporation in him. Reprobation is left wisely alone. There is a final chapter on the calling of God in our particular avocation. Prof. Riddell accepts the protest of Alan Richardson against the secularization of the biblical concept of calling in the conventional use of the term "vocation", but he insists that if we do not serve Christ in our work our Christianity is a leisure occupation. A solid, deep, thorough, inclusive, eirenical book.

Also concerned with evangelism is *The Word for this Century*—a compendium by associates of Wheaton Graduate School, U.S.A. The best known contributor is Billy Graham, and "when Billy Graham stands up to preach he declares 'the Bible says' " (p. 44). The book is sub-titled "Evangelical Certainties" and is made up of chapters on sin, the authority of the Bible, the person of Christ, re-

demption by Christ, Christ in the believer, the church of God, Christian ethics, the hope of the world, and is headed by a statement of faith. This suggests to me that the Bible is not quite the simple tool which the ingenuous declaration implies. Why not let the Book speak for itself? Do not fundamentalists disagree amongst themselves? Would a Jehovah's Witness, brandishing verbal inerrancy, accept No. 3 in the statement of faith that Jesus is "true God and true man"? On p. 43 K. Kantzer, lumping together in the denigatory category of Neo-Orthodox, such dissimilar characters as Niebuhr, Bultmann, Barth, Brunner and Tillich, complains that these put the Bible in a sieve and receive from it only what sifts through. It seems to me that this charge could be levelled against every student, every school of thought, every church. This is inevitable: otherwise we should all join the Mormons in baptizing for the dead. This becomes serious when the sieve—the statement of faith—gets more important than what is to be sieved and worse when none can be saved except those who accept *our* sievings. Why has God made doctrinal uniformity so difficult? Could it be that the only way he can save men from the tyranny of theologians is by making final peace between them unattainable?

Mrs Bliss in her incitement to discussion, *Christians and the Crowther Report,* touches on the problem of authority and acceptance, by asking the question, "From whom and in what conditions do young people, in point of fact, accept moral teaching?" She notes (p. 27) that the report itself omits all mention of religious worship or of the teaching of the Bible. Yet, of course, our state schools have a compulsory act of worship to start the day and follow this with religious instruction. Thus the most exhaustive report of our time, on the education of the 15s–18s, slides past what is to these adolescents the most important question: "What shall I believe and why?" It is not very prophetic to see that the Lord is dealing with this hypocrisy in the old-fashioned way: he is allowing such a society to break itself in pieces.

Mr Hickman's *The Relationship between Churches and Schools* is principally concerned with helping clergymen not to upset teachers.

How to Teach the Christian Faith is a scheme of work for religious education in church junior schools. This is just the efficient handing on of tradition: writing it in forehead and on gate-post. An excellent course for the four years 7–11, with preparation for worship, forms of worship, hymn lists, book lists, lists of film strips, lists of texts to be learned by repetition as versicle and response. Along with the worship go plans for Bible study, doctrinal and moral instruction. If I were responsible for religious instruction in a school, I would give four cheers for a book like this. But someone will have to stay in after school and do a small imposition for the mis-spellings on p. 51, to learn the correct order of the books of the New Testament, and to write out the name DARWIN a hundred times.

P. Ralph-Bowman.

West Camel,
Yeovil.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Glorney Bolton, *Living a Peter* [a biography of Pope John XXIII by an Anglican] (25s.).

ERNEST BENN: H. G. G. Herklots, *Frontiers of the Church: the Making of the Anglican Communion* (35s.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Rudolf Bultmann and A. Weiser, *Faith* [translation of the article in Kittel's Wörterbuch] (12s. 6d.).

BURNS AND OATES: Julian of Norwich, *The Revelations of Divine Love* [new translation by James Walsh, S.J.] (18s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Prayer* (30s.).

COLLINS: Karl Barth, *The Humanity of God* [three essays] (12s. 6d.); John Dillenberger, *Protestant Thought and Natural Science* [the American edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, July 1961, pp. 294 f.] (30s.).

DARTON, LONGMAN AND TODD: H. A. L. Rice, *The Bridge Builders* [short biographies of nine great Anglicans] (18s.); W. S. F. Pickering (Ed.), *Anglican-Methodist Relations* [papers on non-theological factors] (18s.).

ÉDITIONS "ERASME" (PARIS): Patrick McGurk, *Latin Gospel Books from* A.D. *400 to* A.D. *800* [a descriptive catalogue] (n.p.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Harvey K. McArthur, *Understanding the Sermon on the Mount* (15s.); David N. Francis (Ed.), *The Preacher's Handbook* (12s. 6d.); George Cornforth, *Six Minor Prophets* (2s.).

FAITH PRESS: Michael Ramsey (Ed.), *Christian Spirituality To-day* [essays contributed to the *York Quarterly*, 1959–60] (5s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Schubert M. Ogden (Ed.), *Existence and Faith* [a selection from the shorter writings of Rudolf Bultmann] (21s.); Donald Soper, *The Advocacy of the Gospel* (4s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Henry Scougal, *The Life of God in the Soul of Man* (2s.).

MERCIER PRESS (CORK): Bernard Haring, C.S.S.R., *The Law of Christ*, Vol. I, *General Moral Theology* (35s.).

MERLIN PRESS: Walter Stein (Ed.), *Nuclear Weapons and Christian Conscience* (12s. 6d.).

MOWBRAYS: Kenneth N. Ross, *Dangerous Delusions* [on Christian Science, Spiritualism, etc.] (4s. 6d.); J. E. Anderson, *Forty Outline Sermons for Country Parishes* (5s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Norman Goodall, *The Ecumenical Movement* (18s.); M. H. Shepherd, Jr (Ed.), *The Eucharist and Liturgical Renewal* [addresses to a Liturgical Conference at San Antonio, Texas, in November 1959] (21s.); E. W. Watson, *The Church of England* [Home University Library, new edition revised by Dr Alwyn Williams] (8s. 6d.).

PENGUIN BOOKS: St Augustine, *Confessions* [new translation by R. S. Pine-Coffin] (5s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Gustaf Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church* [revised and enlarged edition] (40s.); Peter Coleman, *Experiments in Prayer* (5s.).

SHEED AND WARD: V. Wilkin, S.J., *From Limbo to Heaven* (7s.); Hans Kung, *The Council and Reunion* (11s. 6d.); D. E. Lupton, *A Guide to Reading the Bible* (7s.).

S.P.C.K.: Raymond Samuel Forster, *The Sierra Leone Church* (3s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: E. M. B. Green, *2 Peter Reconsidered* (1s. 6d.).

UNITED SOCIETY FOR CHRISTIAN LITERATURE: G. Parrinder, *The Way to Worship* (2s.); Jim Sutton (Ed.), *From Every Nation* (2s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

FROM OUR WINTER LIST

Walther Eichrodt

Theology of the Old Testament

VOLUME I

The third title in **The Old Testament Library.** Already published: *A History of Israel* by John Bright (40s net); *Genesis* by Gerhard von Rad (50s net).

Barnabas Lindars

New Testament Apologetic

The quotations from the Old Testament to be found in the New Testament are here used as a tool in the task of research into the origins of Christianity. 35s net

Edited by Gerald H. Anderson

The Theology of the Christian Mission

Twenty-five theologians, including Oscar Cullmann, Karl Barth and Paul Tillich, contribute to this ecumenical re-appraisal. 35s net

A new title in **World Mission Studies.** Already published: *The Christian Ministry in Africa* by Bengt Sundkler (35s net); *The Growth of the Church in Buganda* by John V. Taylor (25s net); *Christians of the Copperbelt* by John V. Taylor and D. Lehmann (cloth 30s net, paper 16s net); *East African Rebels* by F. B. Welbourn (21s net).

James D. Smart

The Interpretation of Scripture

Dr Smart, Professor of Biblical Interpretation at Union Theological Seminary, New York, brings into the open large questions about the *truth* of the Biblical material. 35s net

Published in **The Preacher's Library;** Previous volumes: *The Living Word* by Gustaf Wingren (25s net); *A Gospel Without Myth?* by David Cairns (25s net); *The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer* by John D. Godsey (25s net).

SCM PRESS

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND PASTORAL CARE

C. D. Kean **15s. net**

Dr Kean makes a practical and thorough examination of the many difficulties involved in effective pastoral care, and the great contribution of this book is that it shows the intimate connection between pastoral care, Christian faith, and the doctrine of the Church. Here we have set forth the way in which, on a basis of sure faith and sound doctrine, priest and layman can help those in trouble.

COUNSEL AND CONSENT

The Bampton Lectures for 1960

E. W. Kemp **27s. 6d. net**

A history of the two Convocations of Canterbury and York: authoritative, fully documented, and lucid, it sets out the story of the development of self-government in the Church, parallel with the development of parliamentary democracy in England. The special difficulties and opportunities, arising from the Establishment, are pointedly illustrated.

A PRIEST'S NOTEBOOK OF PRAYER

A Priest's Library

J. H. L. Morrell **9s. 6d. net**

The Bishop of Lewes says that he "has tried to keep in mind throughout the ordinary parish clergyman, always at the mercy of expected interruptions and calls", and to provide him with a book of prayers and advice about praying which he can carry about with him and read in odd moments of the day.

ACADEMIC ILLUSION

Denis Bayly **17s. 6d. net**

Published in the U.S.A. by the Seabury Press

A penetrating analysis of the predicament of the American university to-day: the invasion of institutions of higher learning by the ills of contemporary society—the senselessness of power, the lethargy, the symptoms of insecurity and indifference. The diagnosis is relevant to the English scene at a time of rapid expansion in university life here, and the whole position of the university in national life is the subject of keen debate.